



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,414	07/30/2001	Mitsunori Shirato	9333/278	4586

7590 04/24/2007
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/918,414

Applicant(s)

SHIRATO, MITSUNORI

Examiner

Sumaiya A. Chowdhury

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 14-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(a) Applicant argues "As amended, the program type identifiers of claim 1 identify at least a topic associated with content of a program segment. In contrast, Goddard teaches performing actions based on a rating associated with program content" on pages 8-9 of the Remarks filed 3/27/07.

The content rating describes the nature of the content and its appropriateness for particular audiences (col. 5, lines 54-57). Therefore, a topic associated with content of a program segment is identified. If the user chooses to block or unblock content similar to the example content, the acceptable content rating parameters are adjusted, based on the content rating of the example content. The content control system compares the content rating of the example content to the existing acceptable content rating parameters and modifies the acceptable content rating parameters based on the comparison. The acceptable content rating parameters may then be used to provide a content rating threshold for blocking future access to the example content and any

Art Unit: 2623

content having ratings similar to the example content (col. 7, lines 30-41). The parameters are based on the topic of the content. For instance, if the content involves an adult content topic, the content-rating would be TV-R, allowing it to be blocked from children if set accordingly by the parent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim(s) 1, 3-7, 9-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (6684240) in view of Knudson (6473559) and Legall (6005565).

As to claim 1,

a receiving unit operable to receive a plurality of program information segments, each of said plurality of program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers ("Exemplary ratings enabled media may include, but are not limited to, broadcast television, cable television services, pay-per-view services, video on demand services, digital satellite television services, DVD, video cassette, laserdisc,

Art Unit: 2623

radio, cable music services, compact discs (CD), audio cassette tape, the Internet, intranets, and the like" col. 3, lines 55-67), each program type identifier identifying at least a topic associated with a content of a program information segment (The content rating describes the nature of the content and its appropriateness for particular audiences (col. 5, lines 54-57). Therefore, a topic associated with content of a program segment is identified. If the user chooses to block or unblock content similar to the example content, the acceptable content rating parameters are adjusted, based on the content rating of the example content. The content control system compares the content rating of the example content to the existing acceptable content rating parameters and modifies the acceptable content rating parameters based on the comparison. The acceptable content rating parameters may then be used to provide a content rating threshold for blocking future access to the example content and any content having ratings similar to the example content (col. 7, lines 30-41). The parameters are based on the topic of the content. For instance, if the content involves an adult content topic, the content rating would be TV-R, allowing it to be blocked from children if set accordingly by the parent);

a program type information extracting unit (content control system) in communication with the receiving unit, the program type information extracting unit operable to extract a plurality of program type identifiers from an input signal (The content control system filters content received based on TV ratings- col. 8, lines 7-23);

a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to designate at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers

Art Unit: 2623

invalid in response to a user input (Parent determines a particular program should be blocked based on content. Thereafter, when a user selects the same program, the user will only be able to view it by entering the correct PIN number – col. 11, lines 11-43);

an editing result storage unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program type identifiers that have been designated invalid by said program type information editing unit ("Preferably, the user commands the content control system to block or unblock the example content at any time during or after accessing (e.g., viewing or listening to) the content, provided additional example content has not been requested. However, in a more flexible embodiment, the content control system may store the identification and content rating of example content provided to the user. In this manner, the user may thereafter choose to block or unblock that content, for instance, after viewing additional content, or before turning off the information appliance providing the content by recalling the identification of the example content from the memory whereupon the content control system may be commanded to block or unblock content similar to the example content. Similarly, in one embodiment, the present invention may allow the user to block or unblock example content without first viewing the content. For example, the user may have prior knowledge of the example content and may wish to adjust the acceptable content rating parameters so content similar to the example content is blocked or unblocked without again viewing the content" col. 7, lines 10-30).

A display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display a plurality of program type identifiers, and to identify one or more program type

Art Unit: 2623

identifiers as being invalid (display system 612, fig 6; display 614, fig. 6; fig. 1 and 2 show the block/unblock (valid/invalid) of channels, col. 4, lines 31-45);

Goddard teaches blocking a program (fig. 4A, el. 408).

Goddard fails to specifically teach:

displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit.

a program search processing unit in communication with the editing result storage unit, the program search processing unit operable to search for programs using only program type identifiers that have not been designated invalid.

In an analogous art, Knudson discloses displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit (col. 8, lines 11-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Goddard's system to teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit, as taught by Knudson, so as to allow parents to block programs that they readily think of, and to also block titles with explicit words.

However, Goddard and Knudson fail to teach:

a program search processing unit in communication with the editing result storage unit, the program search processing unit operable to search for programs using only program type identifiers that have not been designated invalid.

In an analogous art, Legall teaches the user is presented with a window from which the user selects elements to filter out any content that the user would find undesirable. For instance, referring to element 345 in Fig. 3B, the user can select to have content filtered out by program rating – col. 3, lines 28-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Goddard and Knudson's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Legall, for the advantage of displaying only desirable content to the user.

As to claim 3,

an operating unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to select program type identifiers displayed by said display unit, wherein said program type information editing unit designates the program type identifier selected by said operating unit invalid (see Goddard; input/output system 616, fig. 6; and as discussed in claim 1);

As to claim 4,

wherein said display unit displays text corresponding to at least one of said program type identifiers and identifies whether said at least one of said program type identifiers is invalid (see Goddard; figures 4A, 4B, 5; col. 8, lines 5-22; "Consequently, the parent may wish to block access to the television program and other television programs having similar content. As shown in FIG. 1, the parent selects the

"Block/Unblock" button 130 provided in region 104 thereby commanding the parental control system to block the example television program. Alternately, if the parent has requested a television program, and that program is blocked by the parental control system, the parent may enter a password to override the block and view the program. The information appliance may then display the television program within the television viewer region or window 132 of the user interface 100. If the parent thereafter determines that the television program was inappropriately blocked, depressing the "Block/Unblock" button 130 will unblock the television program and all similar programs. Again, as discussed more fully above, in exemplary embodiments, the parent may select the "Block/Unblock" button 130 at any time after selecting the television program; i.e., prior to or instead of viewing the program, while viewing of the program, or after viewing the program" col. 8, lines 23-42).

As to claim 5, Goddard teaches:

wherein the program type editing unit may designate a program type identifier to be invalid for a program even if the program type identifier was associated with the program when received by the receiving unit (During initial use, the receiver allows all programs to pass through. Thereafter, the user selectively blocks content such that the content will be filtered according to the user's criteria – col. 6, lines 34-50).

As to claim 6,

wherein said one or more program type identifiers comprises a first program type identifier and a second program type identifier, said first program type identifier provided by a program provider and said second program type identifier optionally added by a user (see Goddard; "In further examples of the present invention, the content control system may utilize multiple acceptable content rating parameters providing content rating thresholds for media using different rating schemes. When a user views example content in a first media using a first rating scheme and blocks or unblocks the example content causing the system to adjust the acceptable content rating parameter for that media, the acceptable content ratings parameters for media using other ratings schemes may also be adjusted accordingly. This adjustment may be accomplished, in one embodiment, by equating ratings of the various rating schemes utilized by the media. For instance, wherein the media is television employing both the TV parental guideline and MPAA ratings schemes, a TV rating of TV-G may be equated to an MPAA rating of G, a TV rating of TV-PG may be equated to an MPAA rating of PG, and so forth. However, it will be appreciated that the ratings used by one ratings scheme may not necessarily correspond one for one with the ratings used by a second ratings scheme. In such cases, a given rating in one scheme may usually be equated to a more restrictive rating in a second scheme. Thus, in the proceeding example, a TV-rating of TV-14 may be equated to the slightly more restrictive MPAA rating of PG-13, while a TV-rating of TV-MA may be equated to the more restrictive MPAA rating of R. Thus, wherein an information appliance is capable of accessing multiple media, for example, television, DVD movies, VCR movies, the Internet, and the

like, a user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes" col. 7, line 8 to col. 8, line 5 ; fig. 3; fig. 5).

As to claim 7,

a receiving unit operable to receive a plurality of program information segments, each of said plurality of program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers, each program type identifier identifying at least a topic associated with a content of a program information segment; a program type information extracting unit in communication with the receiving unit, the program type information extracting unit operable to extract a plurality of program type identifiers from an input signal; a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to designate at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers valid for the program segment in response to a user input ; an editing result storage unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program type identifiers that have been designated valid by said program type information editing unit (met as discussed in claim 1).

A display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display a plurality of program type identifiers, and to identify one or more program type identifiers as being invalid (display system 612, fig 6; display 614, fig. 6; fig. 1 and 2 show the block/unblock (valid/invalid) of channels, col. 4, lines 31-45);

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of

program type identifiers as being invalid if the at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers does not specifically disclose correspond to the program information segment (col. 4, lines 31-45).

Goddard teaches blocking a program (fig. 4A, el. 408).

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers as being valid for the program information segment, even if the at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers was not associated with the program information segment when received by the receiving unit (During initial use, the receiver allows all programs to pass through. Thereafter, the user selectively blocks content such that the content is filtered according to the user's criteria – col. 6, lines 34-50).

Goddard fails to specifically teach:

displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit.

a program search processing unit in communication with the editing result storage unit, the program search processing unit operable to search for programs using only program type identifiers that are designated valid;

In an analogous art, Knudson discloses displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit (col. 8, lines 11-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Goddard's system to teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received

by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit, as taught by Knudson, so as to allow parents to block programs that they readily think of, and to also block titles with explicit words.

However, Goddard and Knudson fail to disclose:

a program search processing unit in communication with the editing result storage unit, the program search processing unit operable to search for programs using only program type identifiers that are designated valid;

In an analogous art, Legall teaches the user is presented with a window from which the user selects elements to filter out any content that the user would find undesirable. For instance, referring to element 345 in Fig. 3B, the user can select to have content filtered out by program rating – col. 3, lines 28-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Goddard and Knudson's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Legall, for the advantage of displaying only desirable content to the user.

As to claim 9,

further comprising: a display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display said at least one of said program type identifiers; and an operating unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to select program type identifiers displayed by said display unit, wherein said program type information editing

Art Unit: 2623

unit designates the program type identifier selected by said operating unit valid (met as discussed in claim 3).

As to claim 10,

said display unit displays text corresponding to at least one of said program type identifiers and identifies whether said at least one of said program type identifiers is valid (met as discussed in claim 4).

As to claim 11,

further comprising a program search processing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program information segments with one or more program type identifiers that correspond to one or more program type identifiers selected by a user (met as discussed in claim 5).

As to claim 12,

said one or more program type identifiers comprises a first program type identifier and a second program type identifier, said first program type identifier provided by a program provider and said second program type identifier optionally added by a user (met as discussed in claim 6).

As to claim 14,

wherein said receiving unit is a digital broadcast receiving unit ("In embodiments of the invention, the method may be implemented as a program of instructions executable by one or more information appliances including but not limited to digital information appliances" Goddard, col. 2, lines 53-59).

3. Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard in view of Legall.

As to claim 15,
receiving a plurality of program information segments, each of said program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers, each program type identifier identifying at least a topic associated with a content of a program information segment (The content rating describes the nature of the content and its appropriateness for particular audiences (col. 5, lines 54-57). Therefore, a topic associated with content of a program segment is identified. If the user chooses to block or unblock content similar to the example content, the acceptable content rating parameters are adjusted, based on the content rating of the example content. The content control system compares the content rating of the example content to the existing acceptable content rating parameters and modifies the acceptable content rating parameters based on the comparison. The acceptable content rating parameters may then be used to provide a content rating threshold for blocking future access to the example content and any content having ratings similar to the example content (col. 7,

lines 30-41). The parameters are based on the topic of the content. For instance, if the content involves an adult content topic, the content rating would be TV-R, allowing it to be blocked from children if set accordingly by the parent); associating a program type validity designation with at least one of said program type identifiers; and

storing results of said act of associating a program type validity designation with at least one of said program type identifiers (met as discussed in claim 1).

Identifying one or more program type identifiers as being invalid (col. 4, lines 31-45).

blocking a program (fig. 4A, el. 408).

However, Goddard fails to teach:

searching for one or more programs that include one or more program type identifiers that have not been identified as being invalid.

In an analogous art, Legall teaches the user is presented with a window from which the user selects elements to filter out any content that the user would find undesirable. For instance, referring to element 345 in Fig. 3B, the user can select to have content filtered out by program rating – col. 3, lines 28-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Goddard's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Legall, for the advantage of displaying only desirable content to the user.

As to claim 16,

said program type validity designation comprises a data string corresponding to a valid identification (see Goddard; "In further examples of the present invention, the content control system may utilize multiple acceptable content rating parameters providing content rating thresholds for media using different rating schemes. When a user views example content in a first media using a first rating scheme and blocks or unblocks the example content causing the system to adjust the acceptable content rating parameter for that media, the acceptable content ratings parameters for media using other ratings schemes may also be adjusted accordingly. This adjustment may be accomplished, in one embodiment, by equating ratings of the various rating schemes utilized by the media. For instance, wherein the media is television employing both the TV parental guideline and MPAA ratings schemes, a TV rating of TV-G may be equated to an MPAA rating of G, a TV rating of TV-PG may be equated to an MPAA rating of PG, and so forth. However, it will be appreciated that the ratings used by one ratings scheme may not necessarily correspond one for one with the ratings used by a second ratings scheme. In such cases, a given rating in one scheme may usually be equated to a more restrictive rating in a second scheme. Thus, in the proceeding example, a TV-rating of TV-14 may be equated to the slightly more restrictive MPAA rating of PG-13, while a TV-rating of TV-MA may be equated to the more restrictive MPAA rating of R. Thus, wherein an information appliance is capable of accessing multiple media, for example, television, DVD movies, VCR movies, the Internet, and the like, a user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based

on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes" col. 7, line 8 to col. 8, line 5 ; fig. 3; fig. 5).

As to claim 17,

said program type validity designation comprises a data string corresponding to an invalid identification (see Goddard; "In further examples of the present invention, the content control system may utilize multiple acceptable content rating parameters providing content rating thresholds for media using different rating schemes. When a user views example content in a first media using a first rating scheme and blocks or unblocks the example content causing the system to adjust the acceptable content rating parameter for that media, the acceptable content ratings parameters for media using other ratings schemes may also be adjusted accordingly. This adjustment may be accomplished, in one embodiment, by equating ratings of the various rating schemes utilized by the media. For instance, wherein the media is television employing both the TV parental guideline and MPAA ratings schemes, a TV rating of TV-G may be equated to an MPAA rating of G, a TV rating of TV-PG may be equated to an MPAA rating of PG, and so forth. However, it will be appreciated that the ratings used by one ratings scheme may not necessarily correspond one for one with the ratings used by a second ratings scheme. In such cases, a given rating in one scheme may usually be equated to a more restrictive rating in a second scheme. Thus, in the proceeding example, a TV-rating of TV-14 may be equated to the slightly more restrictive MPAA rating of PG-13, while a TV-rating of TV-MA may be equated to the more restrictive

MPAA rating of R. Thus, wherein an information appliance is capable of accessing multiple media, for example, television, DVD movies, VCR movies, the Internet, and the like, a user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes" col. 7, line 8 to col. 8, line 5 ; fig. 3; fig. 5).

As to claim 18,

further comprising the acts of: displaying information corresponding to at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers for said plurality of program information segments; and selecting at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers (see Goddard; input/output system 616, fig. 6; and as discussed in claim 1).

As to claim 19,

further comprising the act of distinguishing program identifiers according to a program type validity designations (see Goddard; figures 4A, 4B, 5; col. 8, lines 5-22; "Consequently, the parent may wish to block access to the television program and other television programs having similar content. As shown in FIG. 1, the parent selects the "Block/Unblock" button 130 provided in region 104 thereby commanding the parental control system to block the example television program. Alternately, if the parent has requested a television program, and that program is blocked by the parental control system, the parent may enter a password to override the block and view the program. The information appliance may then display the television program within the television

viewer region or window 132 of the user interface 100. If the parent thereafter determines that the television program was inappropriately blocked, depressing the "Block/Unblock" button 130 will unblock the television program and all similar programs. Again, as discussed more fully above, in exemplary embodiments, the parent may select the "Block/Unblock" button 130 at any time after selecting the television program; i.e., prior to or instead of viewing the program, while viewing of the program, or after viewing the program" col. 8, lines 23-42).

As to claim 20,

further comprising the act of selecting a subset of program information segments utilizing said program type identifiers and said program type validity designations (During initial use, the receiver allows all programs to pass through. Thereafter, the user selectively blocks content such that the content will be filtered according to the user's criteria – see Goddard, col. 6, lines 34-50).

As to claim 21,

said plurality of program type identifiers comprise a plurality of first program type identifiers and a plurality of second program type identifiers, said plurality of first program type identifiers being provided by a program provider and said plurality of second program type identifiers being optionally provided by a user (see Goddard; "In further examples of the present invention, the content control system may utilize multiple acceptable content rating parameters providing content rating thresholds for

media using different rating schemes. When a user views example content in a first media using a first rating scheme and blocks or unblocks the example content causing the system to adjust the acceptable content rating parameter for that media, the acceptable content ratings parameters for media using other ratings schemes may also be adjusted accordingly. This adjustment may be accomplished, in one embodiment, by equating ratings of the various rating schemes utilized by the media. For instance, wherein the media is television employing both the TV parental guideline and MPAA ratings schemes, a TV rating of TV-G may be equated to an MPAA rating of G, a TV rating of TV-PG may be equated to an MPAA rating of PG, and so forth. However, it will be appreciated that the ratings used by one ratings scheme may not necessarily correspond one for one with the ratings used by a second ratings scheme. In such cases, a given rating in one scheme may usually be equated to a more restrictive rating in a second scheme. Thus, in the proceeding example, a TV-rating of TV-14 may be equated to the slightly more restrictive MPAA rating of PG-13, while a TV-rating of TV-MA may be equated to the more restrictive MPAA rating of R. Thus, wherein an information appliance is capable of accessing multiple media, for example, television, DVD movies, VCR movies, the Internet, and the like, a user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes" col. 7, line 8 to col. 8, line 5 ; fig. 3; fig. 5).

As to claim 22,

further comprising the act of initially setting all program type validity designations to identify all program type identifiers to be valid (if the user does not block any programs, all programs are "initially set to be valid"; Goddard, col. 8, lines 5-22).

As to claim 23,

further comprising the act of initially setting all program type validity designations to identify all program type identifiers to be invalid (the user may block all programs; Goddard; col. 8, lines 42-65").

4. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (6684240) in view of Knudson (6473559) and Legall as applied to claim 1/7 above, and further in view of Kawamura.

As to claim 2, Goddard, Knudson, and Legall disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Goddard discloses:

a front end unit in communication with said antenna (met as discussed in claim 1); a program selector in communication with said signal demodulator ("As used herein, any on-screen graphical object which is described as a button or otherwise said to be selectable or otherwise accessed is intended to refer to on-screen objects which may advantageously be controlled with a pointing device such as a mouse or other device for controlling an on-screen pointer or cursor and generating mouse button events, although it will be recognized that many of such objects may also be made accessible

through input via a keyboard, keypad, remote control device, or like input device as well" col. 5, lines 5-14); an audio decoder in communication with said program selector (as necessary to output audio data through the speaker; "speaker, audio amplifier" col. 12, lines 40-67); an amplifier in communication with said digital to audio converter; and a speaker in communication with said amplifier ("speaker, audio amplifier" col. 12, lines 40-67).

However, Goddard, Knudson, and Legall fail to teach:

an antenna; a signal demodulator in communication with said front end unit; a digital to audio converter in communication with said audio decoder.

In an analogous art, Kawamura et al. teaches an antenna television network [0012], a video demodulator [0012], and D/A converter [0014].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Goddard, Knudson, and Legall reference to include an antenna, demodulator, and D/A converter, as to utilize "the convergence of computer and consumer electronics into a single system" col. 12, lines 26-39.

As to claim 8,

said receiving unit comprises: an antenna; a front end unit in communication with said antenna; a signal demodulator in communication with said front end unit; a program selector in communication with said signal demodulator; an audio decoder in communication with said program selector; a digital to audio converter in communication with said audio decoder; an amplifier in communication with said digital

to audio converter; and a speaker in communication with said amplifier (met as discussed in claim 2).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAC



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600